HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 47 Saturday, November 24, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Tension As Usual: Last week, HUMAN EVENTS reported tension and anxiety in Governmental quarters over the possibility of war in Europe and the Middle East. This week, some observers here profess to find a relaxation in this touchy situation. But such a view is challenged by others.

"Objectively," the latter say, "there is nothing discernible of a comforting nature. Yes, it is true — it seems to be better. But that is because we are getting used to living under this tension. This week, it does not *seem* to be so bad, that's all."

Especially negative are reports that Soviet Russia is continuing to send her troops into satellite states — notably Romania and Bulgaria. The latter moves point the armed finger at Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia. It is from this Balkan area that the Soviet's so-called "volunteer" troops would be sent to Syria and other Arab states — if Moscow really intends to send them.

No oil from Iraq flows out of the Iraq Petroleum Company's pipeline, into the Mediterranean, for Syrians smashed pumping stations and cut the line. The petroleum from Saudi Arabia, however, continues to flow to Sidon on the Mediterranean.

Government sources here say this may prove only a temporary situation. Ibn Saud saw to it that his profitable "black gold" continued to flow, but only on the understanding that none of it should go to Britain or France. These sources say that if some of the oil should be transshipped to these countries then the Arabs would straightway cut this pipeline.

"Volunteers" or not, old hands here believe Soviet Russia is in the Middle East to stay, and whatever disposition is made of Suez, the West will continue, even under the best conditions, to have a great deal of trouble in this area. It is recalled that (1) this region has been a traditional Russian target, even under the Czars; (2) right after World War II, Muscovites sought to breach it via the autonomous Iranian province of Azerbaijan and later through Iran itself (under Mossadegh); (3) the area, with forward Western air bases, is just too near to Russian industrial areas for comfort.

Private advices, two days old, from Vienna to HUMAN EVENTS, say that many Hungarian Freedom Fighters have escaped across the border into Yugoslavia, where they have been well treated by Tito's Government. No word of this has leaked out from Belgrade, as Tito is playing it very cagy. But it is believed that the Soviets are aware of the fact.

Military Security: As the international barometer descends, heightening interest is directed to the state of our military security. On Capitol Hill, warnings of the extent and danger of Communist activities come from prominent military men and from committees.

Thus, retired Army Lt. Gen. John W. O'Daniel said on November 16 that Communist activity in Hawaii poses a definite threat to U. S. military security. O'Daniel knows this situation well, as he was in command of Army forces in the Pacific from 1952 to 1954. He said Communists in Hawaii were a real threat to our security when he was there, and later visits to the islands convinced him "the danger is just as great or greater now." The Communists, he said, control major trade unions in Hawaii. When he was in command, he conducted 24-hour practice alerts every three months to prepare for "what might happen" in a Communist uprising within the territory.

O'Daniel testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which next week will hold hearings in Hawaii on this matter.

A strike by the International Longshoremen's Association, "freezing" ports along the entire East Coast, drew big headlines last week. Unheralded but of major significance was the "sympathy" strike voted by Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Association — a move which meant paralyzing ports on the West Coast and in Hawaii. It was this threat which

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triggered President Eisenhower's invoking of Taft-Hartley to stop the week-long strike. Bridges, who for years has battled deportation proceedings brought because of his Communist connections, is often described as the "real ruler" of Hawaii. Capital staff men who know the power wielded by a strong and aggressive union say that the recent strike, confirming once more the power that Bridges wields, underlines the necessity for a thorough investigation by the Eastland Subcommittee.

Meanwhile, the House Un-American Activities Committee has been conducting some hearings (November 13 and 14) which reveal why the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, some of the provisions of which serve to keep out Communists, has been so thoroughly smeared throughout the country. The Committee at these hearings brought out much testimony on Communist moves to discredit and destroy anti-Communist legislation.

Officers of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, which the House Committee counsel said was a front organization under complete Communist domination, refused to answer many questions as they invoked constitutional rights under the First and Fifth Amendments. The ACPFB devotes most of its activity to attacking the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. Archibald Roosevelt (a son of former President Theodore Roosevelt), representing The Alliance, Inc., and also the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, declared that unrestricted immigration "would be one of the best weapons the international Communists can be given for the conquest of the United States."

Dulles: The clamor for the scalp of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles this week picked up a somewhat surprising new recruit: the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, strong supporters of Mr. Eisenhower and his "modern Republicanism" but staunchly anti-Communist in all respects.

An obviously policy editorial, published in the chain's *Washington Daily News*, praised Dulles' cabinet record but concluded that because of his recent cancer operation and his advancing years (69 in February), "it is almost inescapable that President Eisenhower will have to find a new Secretary of State."

The editorial does not tip the hand of the "liberal" Republicans, for whom the chain frequently speaks, by suggesting any specific replacement.

Speculation, however, involves such internationalists as Gen. Alfred Gruenther, newly named head of the American Red Cross, who probably will stay in that post; former Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York, unwilling — for the moment — to leave his highly lucrative New York law practice; financier John McCloy ("terrible to contemplate," says one top GOP Senator); retiring Governor Christian Herter of Massachusetts, in line, according to the White House, for an unspecified top Government job, and Ambassador to the U. N. Henry Cabot Lodge.

Best available information is that Dulles will return to his cabinet post next month, as scheduled, and stay on for the time being. Some time along in 1957, however — perhaps about March or April — he is expected to step down of his own accord.

Meanwhile, the claque of leftist pundits, who long have used Dulles as a favorite whipping boy, now are combining their attacks on him with violent criticisms of his temporary stand-in, Acting Secretary Herbert Hoover, Jr.

Quite obviously, they fear and are trying to forestall what many conservatives seek — i.e., appointment of Hoover to succeed Dulles.

The word is that the onetime President's son is impressing Mr. Eisenhower quite favorably by his handling of the rigorous State Department duties during Dulles' health-enforced absence. So much so, that were it not for the contrary suasions of several of the President's internationalist and "liberal" advisers — to whom the mere name "Hoover" is anathema — he would be a front runner for the post; as it is now, his selection seems unlikely.

Zellerbach: The contemplated designation of James D. Zellerbach, president of the paper-making Crown Zellerbach Corporation, to succeed Clare Boothe Luce as U. S. Ambassador to Italy, is arousing much adverse comment around the Capitol.

It is doubtful, however, that the private criticism will flare into open opposition when his name comes before the Senate for confirmation next year, because most members feel it would be another bound-to-fail, "lost cause" battle.

Opinion among conservatives is that Zellerbach is a Johnny-come-lately, ultra-"liberal" Republican of the Paul Hoffman stripe, probably recommended for the job by Hoffman himself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just this week, Zellerbach retired from the Board of Directors of the anti-anti-Communist Fund for the Republic (his term expired), of which Hoffman has been Board Chairman. He also is a trustee of the ultra-internationalist Committee for Economic Development, and is president of the World Affairs Council of Northern California, as well as being associated with various other "liberal" internationalist causes.

Like Hoffman, Zellerbach served in various capacities under President Truman, heading the ECA mission to Italy from 1948 to 1950 and serving as U. S. Employer delegate to the notorious International Labor Organization from 1945 to 1948.

No official announcement has been made yet concerning his appointment, but Washington rumors accept its imminence as fact. Stories from Rome say the Italian government already has been asked about his acceptability; Mrs. Luce's resignation, effective late next month, was announced by the White House this week.

George Kennan: "Incredible" is the word applied in Washington to an interview, in this week's *Saturday Evening Post,* between reporter Joseph Alsop and former Ambassador to Moscow George F. Kennan. Billed by the *Post* as our "No. 1 expert on Russia," Kennan tells Alsop that a great "fundamental force" is at work in the satellite countries, and that uprisings such as those in Poland and Hungary are bound to come everywhere in the Soviet Empire.

Observers here say Kennan is probably right about this. What sends them reeling in disbelief is the claim of Kennan, Alsop, and the *Post* that Kennan has said all along that just such a thing would happen — a claim documented by a statement Kennan made eleven years ago. As recently as May of *this year*, it is recalled, Kennan said, referring to efforts by exiles from Communist rule to mobilize sentiment to free their enslaved countrymen:

> **". . . there is a finality, for better or worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe, and it is no form of service to these people to encourage them to believe that they could return and pick up where they left off 10 or 20 years ago." (*U. S. News and World Report*, June 29, 1956.)**

Neutralism Defined: Those who protested the official "Red Carpet" treatment for President Sukarno of Indonesia, when he visited the U. S. last spring, point to current events in that country as support for their case against so-called "neutralism." Praised here as the "George Washington" of his island kingdom, and garlanded with the acclaims of U. S. officialdom, Sukarno returned to Indonesia. Since arriving, he has recently:

(1) Called for an end to political parties. (Press reports say he is mimicking the one-party rule of Tito.)

(2) Pushed forward a draft constitution outlawing private capitalism, the federal form of government, and the "liberal democracy of the west."

(3) Called for the creation of a "unitary national state."

(4) Incited his people against "subversive activities" and "spies" (Indonesian officials explained that Sukarno did *not* mean the Communists, but was referring to the Dutch.)

From this it is concluded that Sukarno's "neutralism," as claimed all along, is simply Communist fellow travelling in international affairs, and a Communist-model dictatorship at home.

In view of all this, there is much speculation in the Capital as to how the "liberals" will engineer a warm reception for their hero, Jawaharlal Nehru, when he arrives in Washington December 16. India's Prime Minister is the grand prototype for all pro-Communist "neutralists," and it is generally admitted that Sukarno, as he shapes domestic and foreign policies for Indonesia, is merely taking his cues from Nehru.

Hoover: Ex-President Herbert Hoover addressed a Boys' Club in Chicago last Monday, November 19. In his talk he recalled his own comments when Hitler attacked Soviet Russia in June, 1941. "I said," remarked Hoover, "that Britain was now safe from German invasion, due to Hitler's diversion to his attack on Russia. I said the gargantuan jest of all history would be if we should give aid to Stalin in the war. I said the result would be to spread communism over the world. I urged that we stand aside while these two monsters exhausted each other; that if we stood aside, the time would come when we could, by our strength, bring lasting peace to the world."

This Boss Isn't Baffled: Reporters in the Capital drowsing over a table full of releases, many of them reporting tepid speeches by tycoons of private business, received an electric jolt when they read one given by Standard of Indiana President Frank

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prior to the American Petroleum Institute on November 14. He started off by saying that business leaders should not "remain silent when our industry is subjected to vicious and irresponsible attacks calculated to undermine public confidence."

Prior went on to say that "there was a time when some of us considered public relations and political affairs as an extra, like chrome on a car. But in politics, the credit goes to those who convince the public. We have allowed a few loud-mouthed demagogues to assume the credit for too many of our achievements. Others have been allowed to discredit us without challenge. . . . We must not only tell the truth, we must sell the truth. If we don't, our free industry will be in serious danger of being taken in bondage.

"Those of our opponents," said Prior, "who favor a socialized and regimented society have worked even harder and done more than we have. Too many times through unchallenged fabrication and distortion, they have confused and bewildered the public and therefore legislators on the basic issues.

"For myself," barked Prior, "I do not intend to stand idly by while political charlatans and pressure groups undermine the industry to which my life has been devoted.

"Are we afraid of the word lobbying? I'm not. I don't pretend to know all of the technical interpretations of the law. But I do know how the word is generally used. I also know that the First Amendment to the Constitution spells out our right to petition the legislators and to submit any information which is in the public interest."

Book Event: *The Vision and The Constant Star*, by A. H. Hobbs; The Long House, Inc., P. O. Box 1103, New York 17, N. Y.; $3.50

In this compact and carefully written indictment, Dr. Hobbs analyzes, and refutes, the basic assumptions of "liberalism." He shows the interconnection of the various "liberal" myths: the belief that man is a product of his environment; that cultures — and therefore values — are relative; that the individual should submerge himself in the group; that "nationalism," on the other hand, is an evil; that reversion to ancient barbarisms — total centralization of society under absolute rule — somehow constitutes "progress."

Dr. Hobbs knits together these strands of "liberal" thought, proving that — even when they seem to run in opposite directions — they begin and end at the same points. In general, Dr. Hobbs says, "liberal" errors stem from "Scientism," a perspective on humanity that is drained of all reverence for life, and ungraced by the scientific accuracy that it imitates.

Similarly, these errors all lead to the collapse of American civilization — a riot of materialism, an absence of values and of honor. To avoid this impending collapse, Hobbs concludes, we must each personally renounce "liberalism's" shoddy misconceptions, and reconfirm the moral and religious values on which our nation was established.

Dr. Hobbs' learned demolition of "Scientism," which flourishes in the fields of sociology and anthropology, is an authoritative one — since he is himself a teacher of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. This is a valuable book for all who seek to isolate and expose the sources of America's cultural "sickness."

Letter from CHARLES EDISON, Former Governor of New Jersey: "As a reader of HUMAN EVENTS for several years, I was delighted to learn from actual experience what an appreciated gift it could be at Christmas time. Last Christmas I gave several subscriptions to friends and they are repeatedly reminding me of their appreciation. To me, HUMAN EVENTS serves as a wonderful antidote to the political news which, all too often, is slanted, innocently or purposely, to the left."

We are in need of several 1954 bound volumes. If you have one you are not using, will you please write P. G. Laws, HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 47 HUMAN EVENTS November 24, 1956

Article Section

FEDERAL AID MARCHES ON

Next: Colleges and Universities

By RUSSELL TURNER

WITH BOTH major parties supporting the principle and disagreeing only in degree, next year's drive for enactment of Federal Aid to Education legislation will be powered with a full head of steam.

Its advocates are marshalling potent and impressive support for their theory — untenable, actually, but nonetheless widely accepted — that states lack the financial resources to do the job of educating their youth properly, that only Uncle Sam can do it.

Those who believe the job should be handled as it always has been in the past — by the individual states, free from Federal interference — face a tough battle, but one which can be won if the public is made to realize the full significance of all it involves.

But while center stage thus is occupied by this conflict over Federal financing of local elementary and secondary schools, another conflict is shaping up in the distant background: a similar effort to insinuate the Federal Government into the financing and conduct of the nation's institutions of higher learning, its colleges and universities.

The pattern is familiar. A seemingly disorganized cacophony has been under way for some time, decrying low salaries paid by colleges and universities, their inability with existing plants to cope with mushrooming enrollments in coming years, the failure of tuition increases to keep pace with inflated-dollar cost increases, and the sad plight of knowledge-hungry students if tuitions were boosted enough to cover those costs. Participating in the chorus are educationists and their professional organizations, such as the highly suspect National Education Association, numerous college and university executives, "Big Government"-minded laymen, and others who would solve all problems, including this, by depositing them in the lap of the Federal Government.

Hard at work in the same background, as might have been anticipated, is a President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. It was appointed by President Eisenhower last April to develop plans, "through studies and conferences," for improving post-high school educational opportunities. Most Washington observers will be surprised, to put it mildly, if this Committee fails ultimately to come up with recommendations for an expansive program of Federal financial aid to improve the facilities and staffs of colleges and universities throughout the nation, and to pay the college bills for a substantial number of young men and women.

THE DRIVE to push such a program through Congress can be expected in earnest along about 1958. The timetable of the educationists contemplates that, by then, Federal aid for elementary and secondary school systems will be a functioning fact of life, and that they then can turn their full attention and energy to doing the same thing for higher education institutions.

Some may ask why there should be this intense desire to bring the nation's educational

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facilities within the scope of the Federal Government's ever expanding powers.

The answer is neither concise nor simple. Some advocate Federal aid because they seek to create in the United States, within the framework of its historic Constitution as reinterpreted by a like-minded Supreme Court, a Welfare State system of near socialism with all power and authority concentrated in Washington; these would include liberal northern Democrats and Fair Dealers everywhere, of the stripe and caliber of Walter Reuther and Americans for Democratic Action. Some feel that adequate financing can be obtained only from the Federal Government, stubbornly and deliberately overlooking the fact that the only source of money for the Federal Government lies in the states and their individual citizens. Some, refusing to recognize the dangers to freedom and liberty inherent in any concentration of power, simply have been duped into going along with the idea that Washington can do a better job of educating Americans than can the states.

Both of the last two categories would do far better, and would be doing far more to protect the freedoms and liberty for which so many Americans have sacrificed their all during the past 180 years, if they would devote their energies to persuading the states to improve their own school systems — elementary, secondary and higher. But how to make them recognize the dangers inherent in the Federal aid course is a problem which for years has baffled libertarians.

In the meantime, Federal aid advocates insist their plans are so swathed in protections that there could not possibly be any Federal control over local schools. It is a Democrat, Governor Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, who puts into words the thought of most Washingtonians when he comments that "Federal aid is invariably followed by Federal control." The one follows the other as a virtually inevitable concomitant.

In 1916, for example, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act providing Federal financial aid for local vocational educational systems. Prior to passage, its proponents insisted vigorously and incessantly that it would involve no Federal control. The promises to the contrary notwithstanding, the Federal regulations have been expanded and expounded over the years until they now fill a 108-page book — "Administration of Vocational Education," published by the Government Printing Office. One sentence on Page 4, however, is all that is necessary: *"Each state is required to submit a plan which must meet with the approval of the Federal Office of Education."* No control?

Many sincere and well-intentioned persons now advocating Federal aid to educational systems would shudder at the prospect of their children attending a college compelled to win approval from the U.S. Office of Education for its program in order to stay in existence; yet the minute the Federal Government gets its foot in the door to college treasuries, such control becomes a distinct probability.

THIS IS NOT to challenge President Eisenhower's sincerity or good intentions in declaring that the Federal Government must aid needy and financially embarrassed states — adding that all conceivable safeguards must be adopted to insure against Federal intervention in operation of the schools. Opposition to his plan stems from forebodings that with the Federal foot thus in the door, future administrations may discard his adjuration against control, that even in this Administration some less idealistic, lower-level bureaucrats may try to circumvent his "stop" signs and impose their own leftist operational theories on federally aided schools.

Do colleges and universities actually need Federal financial assistance? Assistance, yes; Federal assistance, no. For nearly two centuries, this country's higher educational system has pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressed upward and onward with a combination of nongovernmental and state governmental financing. It has constantly called for, and needed, additional funds for expansion and improvements; but by one means or another it has always found the needed essential funds. There is no reason to believe the expansion necessary to handle the anticipated enrollment increase over the next decade cannot be handled the same way.

The educationists cry that worthy youths are being denied an opportunity to continue their education beyond the high school. Under our present non-Federal system, hundreds of millions of dollars are distributed annually as scholarships to qualified students financially unable to meet the cost of a college or professional education; other millions are available for loans to such students. Look around your own community; how many truly capable and worthy young men and women do you find who have been compelled to abandon their quest for knowledge because of inability to finance it? Not many, if any.

One widely overlooked point merits note: so acclimatized have the American people become, under two decades of Democratic near-socialism, to the theory that the Government owes a living (including a college education) to all, that many would-be students will accept nothing less than scholarship grants and spurn all offers of loans which eventually must be repaid. Dr. Donald Cowling, eminent retired President of Carleton College at Northfield, Minn., says hundreds of thousands of dollars were, and are, available to students from loan funds at Carleton but are not used because students refused to entail themselves to a future repayment obligation, and that the same situation exists in most other colleges around the country.

Dr. Cowling states flatly that no talented and worthy student need go without a college education because of a bare wallet.

EVEN ASIDE FROM availability of these unused loan funds, however, the number of privately financed scholarship grants to students is growing constantly. New scholarship funds are being created constantly by individuals and multimillion-dollar philanthropic foundations; corporations and businesses more and more are discharging a part of their civic responsibility by establishment of scholarship grant funds as well as by direct contributions to endowment funds of educational institutions themselves.

Last year, for instance, General Motors Corporation established a scholarship plan which, when fully operative in its fourth year, will cost the Corporation $4,500,000 annually. The Ford Foundation furnished $20,000,000 as the nucleus for a National Merit Scholarship Fund to provide grants to "gifted" students; The Carnegie Corporation added another $500,000 to the kitty, the Sears Roebuck Foundation $600,000, and others followed suit. The Ford Foundation also granted a whopping $260,000,000 to the nation's privately supported colleges and universities to help boost their faculty salaries. Many other less spectacular gifts added up, as they do every year, to very substantial private assistance for all institutions of higher learning.

Viewing the problem realistically, it appears more than likely that the thousands of big and little scholarship funds should be able to finance the higher education of all youngsters possessing both the ability and the desire to absorb such an education, particularly those whose desire is strong enough to persuade them to help themselves.

This is not to say, however, that college educations can or should be provided for all young men or women who have the ability or the desire, but not both. To undertake such a task would be a waste of time and effort and money, to say nothing of a waste of the years spent by such young Americans in college; nevertheless, at least some of the "educationists" now blow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the preliminary trumpets for a Federal Aid to Colleges program have exactly that in mind.

Procedurally, the expectation is that the President's Higher Education Committee will climax its 18-month inquiry late next year with something comparable to last December's notorious White House Conference on Education. That was the parley wherein a minority of professional educationists maintained an iron grip on the proceedings and finally came up with a well-stacked purported majority recommendation for a major Federal aid program; the fact that subsequent surveys of those in attendance indicates the purported majority was strictly a figment of the imagination of the educationists bothered them not a bit.

Committee spokesmen insist no decision has been made yet on whether to recommend the calling of some such national conference, although they concede it might serve their purpose by bringing to public notice the problem of education beyond the high school — which, they emphasize, includes all forms of adult education as well as regular college and university courses.

FOR THE PRESENT, the Committee is in the midst of a series of what it calls regional "workshops" — regional meetings in which staff aides explain to interested parties what the Committee seeks and is trying to do, and lay the groundwork for a series of more formalized "regional conferences" planned for next spring. Aides insist the spring parleys, intended to provide an opportunity for full discussion of problems found in each region, quite well may be the basis for the ultimate report and recommendations to the President, without any one big meeting here in the Capital. It could be; there are many doubters.

Consider carefully before buying the tempting package dangled by the "educationists." First, recognize that the states are just as capable of putting the tax bite on your bank accounts, for the benefits of schools and colleges, as is the Federal Government, and that if the latter does the biting, it simply superimposes at the top another unnecessary administrative echelon to siphon off a percentage of the tax-collected dollars. And second, ponder carefully whether you deem it good for a clique of unreachable career Federal bureaucrats in the U.S. Office of Education to be decreeing how and what your children shall be taught, or whether that authority should be held by your local and state officials who can be replaced in periodic elections.

As should be true on all important governmental issues, tell your Representative and Senators what you believe. The coalition of anti-"Big Government" Republicans and Democrats has stopped Federal aid legislation in the past by doggedly insisting that school systems are reserved by the Constitution to the states. These constitutionalists can do it again if they receive adequate help and encouragement from like-thinking constituents. But their fight has been rugged, and they are not likely to continue it unless they know the people want them to.

As HUMAN EVENTS goes to press, the President's Committee, discussed in the above article, has just issued a preliminary interim report, viewing with alarm the mounting number of students who will be seeking higher education in the next few years, and proposing establishment of new facilities less expensive "than campuses with elms, oaks and other slow-growing trees" to provide that education. The inference is that the Committee's ultimate final report will decide the money for these new institutions, as well as money to improve faculty salaries, must come from the Federal Government.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED